UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/888,473	06/25/2001	Jeffrey Allen Jones	AUS920010398US1	8699

7590   05/23/2005

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER
MARTIN, NICHOLAS A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 05/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/888,473	JONES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas Martin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 January 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/20/03-10/20/04*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 2

1.   Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office Action.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicants arguments filed on 1/12/2005 have been fully considered by they are

not persuasive.

4.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (1) XP does not teach two requests for

the same file piece requesting one of a plurality of pieces of an electronic file, receiving

the requested file piece and receiving a request for said file piece from a client machine,

where one of the requests is redirected from the server.

5.   As to point (1), XP discloses the limitations of two requests for the same file

piece requesting one of a plurality of pieces of an electronic file, receiving the requested

file piece and receiving a request for said file piece from a client machine, where one of

these requests is redirected from the server (Page 1, paragraph 3 "Communication

within the Mojo Nation is a peer-to-peer network, enabling any computer on its network

to talk to any other without having to go through a centralized server..."; Page 1,

paragraph 7 "...a 'client-server' distributed system...split between server tasks and

client tasks...the client sends a request to the server, and the server responds...a

server or client is known as an 'agent'...each agent performs both client and server

roles... distributed pool of agents performing various functions: e.g., relaying messages, tracking, publishing, or storage..."; Page 2, paragraph 7 "...breaking a distributed file into fragments for storage and retrieval Mojo Nation is able to engage many agents working in parallel on each data transfer... allowing a single download to engage a combination of broadband and dial-up users to accomplish the file transfer"; Page 3, paragraphs 1-2 "...when each block has been stored... new blocks are available at their respective addresses. These blocks are then shared between peers...").

6.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (2) XP does not teach a single unitary computer program product that comprises the two recited "instructions for" elements of requesting and receiving.

7.   As to point (2), XP discloses the limitation of a single unitary computer program product that comprises the two recited "instructions for" elements of requesting and receiving (Page 1, paragraph 7 "In a 'client-server' distributed system, software is split between server tasks and client tasks... the client sends a request to the server, and the server responds... distributed pool of agents performing various functions: e.g., relaying messages...").

8.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (3) XP and/or Hartsell do not teach or suggest the claimed step of receiving a request for a file piece from a first client machine, the file piece being a divided portion of an electronic file.

9.   As to point (3), XP teaches the claimed step of receiving a request for a file piece

from a first client machine, the file piece being a divided portion of an electronic file

(Page 1, paragraph 7 "...client sends a request to the server..."; Page 2, paragraph 7

"...breaking a distributed file into fragments for storage and retrieval Mojo Nation is able

to engage many agents working in parallel on each data transfer...allowing a single

download to engage a combination of broadband and dial-up users to accomplish the

file transfer"; Page 3, paragraph 1 "...breaks the original file into several pieces...").

10.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (4) XP and/or Hartsell do not teach or

suggest receiving distinct requests for the same file piece.

11.   As to point (4), Hartsell teaches receiving distinct requests for the same file piece

(Page 20, paragraph [0189] "...request for content...received from a variety of sources";

Page 20, paragraph [0190] "...filtering performed...may serve as a screening agent to

reject requests for content that the receiving system is not capable of processing...").

12.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (5) XP and/or Hartsell do not teach or

suggest that the request for a file piece is redirected to a machine which had itself

requested the file piece.

13.   As to point (5), Hartsell teaches the limitation that the request for a file piece is

redirected (Page 37, paragraph [0303]). XP teaches the limitation of directing to a

machine which has requested the file piece (Page 3, paragraph 5 "...locates every

content tracker available on the system... if the content tracker can match a filename or description to that string, the tracker returns all information it has about the file...").

14.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (6) XP and/or Hartsell do not teach or suggest the claimed feature of sending a digest for a file piece to each client machine which has received that file piece.

15.   As to point (6), XP teaches the limitation of sending a digest for a file piece to each client machine which has received that file piece (Page 2, paragraph 7 "Each agent contributes effort to teach task... allowing a single download to engage a combination of user to accomplish the file transfer..."; Page 4, paragraph 1 "...engaging multiple agents in a single download task... aggregation of low-bandwidth agents together... key features of content distribution system"; Page 4, paragraph 5 "...validating the message's digital signature, which can only be generated by the holder of the sender's private key, while the signature itself is also encrypted by the RSA algorithm").

16.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (7) XP and/or Hartsell do not teach or suggest the claimed feature of receiving a message from a client, wherein the message indicates that a peer-to-peer server has corrupted a file piece.

17.   As to point (7), receiving a message from a client, wherein the message indicates that a peer-to-peer server has corrupted file piece (Page 4, paragraphs 5 "...receives the right hash in response... knows not to repeat the initiating response... ignore any

recurrent use of the hashed response, which protects the system from 'replay'

vandalism. ...because the initiating messager ignores more than one response

containing the correct hash..."; Page 4, paragraphs 5-6 "When an initiating message

and Mojo offer arrives, the respondent checks his price list for services...to see if the

offer is acceptable..."; "Page 5, paragraph 2 "...response times to queries as well as

their dependability for being online when queried, reliability for content and information

delivery...if one Broker tries to cheat another...complete the desired transaction with a

different agent").

18.   As per remarks, Applicants' argued that (8) XP and/or Hartsell do not teach or

suggest the claimed step of disconnecting the peer-to-peer server responsible for

corrupting said file piece.

19.   As to point (8), XP teaches finding an alternate route for routing data responsible

for fraudulent file piece (Page 5, paragraph 2 "...response times to queries as well as

their dependability for being online when queried, reliability for content and information

delivery...if one Broker tries to cheat another...complete the desired transaction with a

different agent"). Hartsell teaches connection loss for unacceptable files (Page 8,

paragraph [0073] "The transport processing engine may perform time out checks for

each network connection, session management, data reordering and retransmission,

data queuing and flow control, packet header generation, etc. off-loading these tasks

from the application processing engine or the network interface processing engine. The

transport processing engine may also handle error checking..."; Page 37, paragraph

[0303] "...a connection may be rejected altogether...active connections allowed to

service degrade...resource state information (e.g., resource availability, capability, etc.)

may be considered in the decision whether to accept or reject particular requests for

information ...for content. Resources may be re-allocated or exchange as desired to

support particular requests...requests may be redirected to alternative system or

nodes.").

20.   As per remarks, Applicants' argue that (9) XP, Hartsell and/or Singhal do not

teach or suggest the claimed step of redirecting said request to a second peer-to-peer

server containing a copy of said file piece.

21.   As to point (9), Hartsell teaches the limitation that the request for a file piece is

redirected (Page 37, paragraph [0303]). XP teaches the limitation of directing to a

machine which has requested the file piece (Page 3, paragraph 5 "...locates every

content tracker available on the system...if the content tracker can match a filename or

description to that string, the tracker returns all information it has about the file...").

22.   As per remarks, Applicants' argue that (10) XP, Hartsell and/or Singhal do not

teach or suggest the claimed step of receiving a request for a file piece stored in a peer-

to-peer server which is no longer connected to the computer network.

23.   As to point (10), as stated from the previous action, Singhal teaches the limitation

of receiving a request for a file piece stored in a peer-to-peer server which is no longer

connected to the computer network (Page 66, Column 2, paragraph 2-3 "... detecting

client host and communication failures. The server maintains timestamps representing

the most recent packet received from each client. The system manager periodically

places a client on "probation" if no packet bas been received with a timeout period.

... the system manager presumes that the client is dead, unregisters the client, and

notifies the clients who where communicating with that host.").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

24.   Claims 7-8, 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by "Technology Overview of Mojo Nation", MOJO Nation, 'Online',

XP002177454, hereinafter XP.

25.   As per claim 7, XP teaches a method for distributing information in a computer

network, comprising:

requesting one of a plurality of pieces of an electronic file, wherein the electronic

file is stored in a server (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 2, paragraph 7; Page 3, paragraph

2);

receiving the requested file piece from the server (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 3, paragraph 2);

receiving the request for said file piece from a client machine, wherein the request is redirected from the server (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 3, paragraph 2);

sending said file piece to said client machine (Page 1, paragraph 7, Page 3, paragraphs 1-2).

26.   As per claim 8, XP teaches a method for obtaining distributed information in a computer network, comprising:

requesting one of a plurality of pieces of an electronic file, wherein the electronic file is stored in a server (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 2, paragraph 7; Page 3, paragraph 2);

receiving the requested file piece from a client machine containing a copy of said file piece, the copy of said file piece on the client machine being the result of a previous request for the file piece from the client machine to the server and receipt of the file piece from the server to the client machine (Page 1, paragraphs 3 and 7; Page 2, paragraph 7; Page 3, paragraphs 1-2).

27.   As per claim 15, XP teaches a computer program product for distributing information in a computer network, the computer program comprising:

instructions for requesting one of a plurality of pieces of an electronic file, wherein the electronic file is stored in a server (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 2, paragraph 7; Page 3, paragraph 2);

instructions for receiving the requested file piece from the server (Page 1,

paragraph 7; Page 3, paragraph 2);

instructions for receiving the request for said file piece from a client machine,

wherein the request is redirected from the server (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 3,

paragraph 2);

instructions for sending said file piece to said client machine (Page 1, paragraph

7, Page 3, paragraphs 1-2).

28.   As per claim 16, XP teaches a computer program product for obtaining

distributed information in a computer network, the computer program comprising:

instructions for requesting one of a plurality of pieces of an electronic file,

wherein the electronic file is stored in a server (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 2, paragraph

7; Page 3, paragraph 2);

instructions for receiving the requested file piece from a client machine

containing a copy of said file piece (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 3, paragraph 2).

29.   Claim 18 does not teach or define any new limitations above claim 7 and

therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

30.   Claim 19 does not teach or define any new limitations above claim 8 and

therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

31.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

32.   Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-11, 13-14 and 17 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over "Technology Overview of Mojo Nation", MOJO Nation, 'Online',

XP002177454 (hereinafter XP), in view of Hartsell et al. (hereinafter Hartsell) US

2002/0174227.

16.   As per claim 1, XP teaches a method for distributing information in a computer

network comprising:

dividing an electronic file into a plurality of pieces (Page 2, paragraph 7);

receiving a request for a file piece from a first client machine (Page 1, paragraph 7);

downloading the requested file piece to the first client machine (Page 3, paragraphs 5-6,

Page 4, paragraph 1).

33.   XP does not teach a method comprising:

receiving a request for said file piece from a second client machine; and

redirecting the request of the second client machine to the first client machine.

34.   Hartsell teaches a method for distributing information in a computer network

comprising:

receiving a request for said file piece from a second client machine (Page 20,

paragraph [0189]);

redirecting the request of the second client machine to the first client machine
(Page 37, paragraph [0303]).

35.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of
invention was made to combine the teaching of XP and Hartsell because they both deal
with the distribution of information within a peer-to-peer file sharing technology.
Furthermore, the teaching of XP discloses that it is beneficial to break up the task of
delivering content among many agents across the network in-order to increase speed
and reliability to Hartsell's file sharing service in-order to create a high-throughput file
transfer.

36.   As per claim 2, XP teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising
downloading all file pieces to a plurality of client machines wherein:

        client machines function as peer-to-peer servers for other client machines
requesting said file pieces (Page 1, paragraph 7).

37.   As per claim 3, XP teaches a method according to claim 2, wherein:

        each peer-to-peer server stores a unique file piece (Page 3, paragraphs 1-2).

38.   As per claim 5, XP teaches a method according to claim 2, further comprising:

        sending a digest for a file piece to each client machine which has received that
file piece (Page 4, paragraph 5).

39.   As per claim 6, XP teaches a method according to claim 5, further comprising:

        receiving a message from a client, wherein the message indicates that a peer-to-
peer server has corrupted file piece (Page 2, paragraph 2; Page 4, paragraphs 5-6);

retransmitting said file piece to said client, wherein the retransmitted file piece is free of any corrupted content (Page 4, paragraph 6).

40.   XP does not teach a method comprising:

disconnecting the peer-to-peer server responsible for corrupting said file piece.

41.   Hartsell teaches a method according to claim 5, further comprising:

disconnecting the peer-to-peer server responsible for corrupting said file piece (Page 37, paragraph [0303]).

42.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of XP and Hartsell because they both deal with validating sending and receiving requests for information within a peer-to-peer file sharing network. Furthermore, the teaching of XP comprising receiving a corrupted message from a client and retransmitting said file piece to said client wherein the retransmitted file piece is free of any corrupted content is an alternative prioritizing approach as seen in Hartsell's file sharing network; clients that transmit corrupt messages and files result in redirecting requests and resources are re-allocated and exchanged with clients transmitting file pieces that are guaranteed authenticity by a validated digital signature.

43.   As per claim 9, XP teaches a computer program product in a computer readable medium for use in a data processing system, for distributing information in a computer network, comprising:

instructions for dividing an electronic file into a plurality of pieces (Page 1,

paragraph 7; Page 2, paragraph 7, Page 3, paragraph 1);

instructions for receiving a request for a file piece from a first client machine

(Page 1, paragraph 7);

instructions for downloading the requested file piece to the first client machine

(Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 3, paragraphs 5-6, Page 4, paragraph 1).

44.   XP does not teach a computer program product comprising:

instructions for receiving a request for said file piece from a second client

machine; and

instructions for redirecting the request of the second client machine to the first

client machine. ·

45.   Hartsell teaches a computer program product for use in a data processing

system for distributing information in a computer network, comprising:

instructions for receiving a request for said file piece from a second client

machine (Page 29, paragraph [0252]); and

instructions for redirecting the request of second client machine to the first client

machine (Page 29, paragraphs [0249], [0250]; Page 37, paragraph [0303]).

46.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of

invention was made to combine the teaching of XP and Hartsell because they both deal

with a computer program product in a computer readable medium for use in a data

processing system, for the distribution of information within a peer-to-peer file sharing

technology. Furthermore, the teaching of XP discloses instructions that it is beneficial to

break up the task of delivering content among many agents across the network in-order to increase speed and reliability to Hartsell's file sharing service in-order to create a high-throughput file transfer.

47.   As per claim 10, XP teaches a computer program product according to claim 9, further comprising:

instructions for downloading all file pieces to a plurality of client machines, wherein the client machines function as peer-to-peer servers for other client machines requesting said file pieces (Page 1, paragraph 7).

48.   As per claim 11, XP teaches a computer program product according to claim 10, wherein each peer-to-peer server stores a unique file piece (Page 3, paragraph 1-2).

49.   As per claim 13, XP teaches a computer program product according to claim 10, further comprising:

instructions for sending a digest for a file piece to each client machine which has received that file piece (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 4, paragraph 5).

50.   As per claim 14, XP teaches a computer program product according to claim 13, further comprising:

instructions for receiving a message from a client, wherein the message indicates that a peer-to-peer server has corrupted a file piece (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 2, paragraph 2; Page 4, paragraphs 5-6);

instructions for retransmitting said file piece to said client, wherein the retransmitted file piece is free of any corrupted content (Page 1, paragraph 7; Page 4, paragraph 6).

51.   XP does not teach a computer program product comprising:

instructions for disconnecting the peer-to-peer server responsible for corrupting

said file piece.

52.   Hartsell teaches a computer program product according to claim 13, further

comprising:

instructions for disconnecting the peer-to-peer server responsible for corrupting

said file piece (Page 29, paragraph [0248]); Page 37, paragraph [0303]).

53.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of

invention was made to combine the teaching of XP and Hartsell because they both deal

with a computer program product setting forth instructions for validating sending and

receiving requests for information within a peer-to-peer file sharing network.

Furthermore, the teaching of XP comprising instructions for receiving a corrupted

message from a client and retransmitting said file piece to said client wherein the

instructions for retransmitted file piece is free of any corrupted content is an alternative

prioritizing approach as seen in Hartsell's file sharing network; clients that transmit

corrupt messages and files are redirected and resources are re-allocated and

exchanged with clients transmitting file pieces that are guaranteed authenticity by a

validated digital signature.

54.   Claim 17 does not teach or define any new limitations above claim 1 and

therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

55.   Claims 4 and 12 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over XP

in view of Hartsell as applied to claims 1-3 and 9-11 above, and in further view of

"Inverse: Designing an Interactive Universe Architecture for Scalability and

Extensibility", Singhal et al. (hereinafter Singhal) XP010245516.

56.   As per claim 4, XP and Hartsell do not explicitly teach the method of claim 2.

57.   Hartsell teaches a method further comprising:

redirecting said request to a second peer-to-peer server containing a copy of said

file (Page 37, paragraph [0303]).

58.   Singhal teaches a method of claim 2, further comprising:

receiving a request for a file piece stored in a first peer-to-peer server which is no

longer connected to the computer network (Page 66, Column 2, paragraph 2-3);

removing the first peer-to-peer server from a list of available peer-to-peer servers

(Page 66, Column 2, paragraph 2-3).

59.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of

invention was made to combine the teaching of XP, Hartsell and Singhal because they

all deal with a faulty connection within a peer-to-peer file sharing network when

receiving requests for content. Furthermore, the teaching of Singhal when receiving a

request for a file piece stored in a peer-to-peer server no longer connected to the

network, then removing that server from a list of available servers is an alternative to

prioritizing requests referenced in Hartsell for file pieces disclosed in XP; broken

connections result in unregistering those clients and notifying other clients who were

communicating with that host.

60.   As per claim 12, XP and Hartsell do not explicitly teach the computer program

product of claim 10.

61.   Hartsell teaches a computer program product according to claim 10 further

comprising:

        instructions for redirecting said request to a second peer-to-peer server

containing a copy of said file (Page 29, paragraphs [0249], [0250]; Page 37, paragraph

[0303])..

62.   Singhal teaches a computer program product of claim 10, further comprising:

        instructions for receiving a request for a file piece stored in a first peer-to-peer

server which is no longer connected to the computer network (Page 65, Column 1,

paragraph 6; Page 66, Column 2, paragraph 2-3);

        instructions for removing the first peer-to-peer server from a list of available peer-

to-peer servers (Page 65, Column 1, paragraph 6; Page 66, Column 2, paragraph 2-3).

63.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of

invention was made to combine the teaching of XP, Hartsell and Singhal because they

all disclose computer program product for dealing with a faulty connection within a peer-

to-peer file sharing network. Furthermore, the teaching of Singhal wherein instructions

for receiving a request for a file piece stored in a peer-to-peer server no longer

connected to the network, then instructions for removing that server from available

servers is an alternative to instructions for prioritizing requests referenced in Hartsell for

file pieces disclosed in XP; broken connections result in unregistering those clients and

notifying other clients who were communicating with that host.

Response to Amendment

64.   Examiner acknowledges amendments to the drawings, which now appear to be in conformance with MPEP § 608.02(d). Objection has been withdrawn.

65.   Examiner acknowledges amendments to the specification, which now appears to be in conformance with MPEP § 608.01(g). Objection has been withdrawn.

66.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Martin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3970. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-3970.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas Martin
May 16, 2005

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100